arXiv:1403.7337v1 [cond-mat.supr-con] 28 Mar 2014

Long-range superharmonic Josephson current and spin-triplet pairing correlations in a junction with ferromagnetic bilayer

Hao Meng,* Xiuqiang Wu, and Feng Mei
National Laboratory of Solid State Microstructures and Department of Physics, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China
(Dated: March 31, 2014)

We study the long-range superharmonic Josephson current in a clean junction composed of two s-wave superconductors and a ferromagnetic bilayer with noncollinear magnetizations. We find that the critical current shows an oscillatory dependence on the exchange field in the thin spin-active ferromagnetic layer, which is induced by the spatial oscillations of triplet state with zero spin projection. In contrast, this critical current decreases monotonically with the exchange field in the thick conducting ferromagnetic layer. Interestingly, when the conducting layer is converted into half metal, the long-range Josephson current is completely prohibited but the parallel spin-triplet state still exists. This behavior is quite distinct from the common knowledge that the long-range Josephson current arises from the transportation of the parallel spin-triplet pairs. We attribute this distinctive behavior to the transition from normal Andreev reflections to normal reflections at the interface between the conducting layer and the superconducting electrode.

PACS numbers: 74.78.Fk, 73.40.-c, 74.50.+r, 73.63.-b

I. INTRODUCTION

The interplay between superconductivity and ferromagnetism in mesoscopic structures has been extensively studied because of the underlying rich physics and potential applications in spintronics [1, 2]. In a homogeneous ferromagnet (F) adjacent to an s-wave superconductor (S), the spin-singlet pairs and triplet pairs without spin projection along the magnetization axis, consisting of two electrons with opposite spins and momenta, just can penetrate into the F a short distance due to the dephasing of the pairing electrons induced by the ferromagnetic exchange field. In contrast, the interested parallel spin-triplet pairs induced by an inhomogeneous ferromagnetism are immune to the pair breaking by exchange interaction in F, hence they are able to propagate in F a long distance approaching the coherence length of the normal-metal [3–6].

Early suggestions to observe this effect is to measure the critical current in a Josephson junction through a ferromagnetic trilayer with noncollinear magnetizations [7, 8]. In this geometry, a spin-flip scattering processes at the interface F layers can convert the singlet Cooper pairs into the parallel spin-triplet pairs which give rise to a long-range triplet current [9, 10]. In addition, many other different inhomogeneous configurations have been proposed for studying such current, including the F with a magnetic domain wall [2, 11] or a spiral magnetic structure [12, 13], the Josephson junction with multilayers of Fs [14] or the spin active interface [9, 15].

More recently, the long-range triplet proximity effect may also occur in ballistic [16] and diffusive [17] bilayer ferromagnetic Josephson junction with noncollinear magnetizations. In this case, a superharmonic Josephson relation is generated by the phase coherent transportation of an even number of parallel spin-triplet pairs. Such transportation has a long-range contribution arising from two normal Andreev reflections (the spin projections of an electron and the reflected hole are opposite) and two anomalous Andreev reflections (an electron and the reflected hole have the same spin projections) [16].

In the above Josephson junction with ferromagnetic bilayer, we are interested in the question what contributions the spin-triplet pairs will make to the superharmonic current with the increase of the spin polarization of the thin spin-active F layer and the particularly thick conducting F layer. It is important to know whether the superharmonic current exists when the conducting F layer has only one spin band occupied by the conduction electrons. In this paper, we show that the superharmonic current will oscillated as a function of the spin-active F layer exchange field. This feature arises from the spatial oscillations of triplet state with zero spin projection in the spin-active F layer. Nevertheless, with increasing the exchange field of conducting F layer the critical current reduces monotonically. When the conducting F layer is fully spin-polarized, the current will disappears completely. This behavior is originated from the transition from normal Andreev reflections to normal reflections at interface between the conducting F layer and superconducting electrode, then the parallel spin-triplet pairs still exist but none of Cooper pairs can penetrate from the conducting F layer into the superconducting electrode.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II we present the dependence of the superharmonic Josephson current on the thickness of conducting layer and the strength of the two F exchange fields. In Sec. III, we display the spatial distributions of the odd-frequency triplet pairs to account for the variations of the superharmonic Josephson current. The conclusions are given in Sec. IV.

* menghao1982@shu.edu.cn



FIG. 1. (color online) Schematic diagram of the $S/F_1/F_2/S$ junction. Two arrows indicate the direction of the magnetizations in thick conducting F_1 and thin spin-active F_2 layers with lengths L_{F1} and L_{F2}, respectively. The phase difference between the two s-wave Ss is $\phi = \phi_R - \phi_L$.

II. SUPERHARMONIC JOSEPHSON CURRENT

We consider a clean Josephson junction consisting of two s-wave superconducting electrodes contacted through ferromagnetic bilayer with noncollinear magnetizations, shown schematically in Fig. 1. The Josephson current is calculated using Blonder-Tinkham-Klapwijk (BTK) approach [19]. The transport direction is along the y axis, and the system is assumed to be infinite in the x-z plane. The BCS mean-field effective Hamiltonian [1, 18] is

$$H_{eff} = \int d\vec{r}\{\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\psi^\dagger_\alpha(\vec{r})[H_e(\hat{\mathbf{1}})_{\alpha\beta} - (\vec{h}\cdot\vec{\sigma})_{\alpha\beta}]\psi_\beta(\vec{r}) + \frac{1}{2}[\sum_{\alpha,\beta}(i\sigma_y)_{\alpha\beta}\Delta(\vec{r})\psi^\dagger_\alpha(\vec{r})\psi^\dagger_\beta(\vec{r}) + h.c.]\}, \quad (1)$$

where $H_e = -\hbar^2\nabla^2/2m - E_F$, $\psi^\dagger_\alpha(\vec{r})$ and $\psi_\alpha(\vec{r})$ are creation and annihilation operators with spin α. $\hat{\sigma}$ and E_F denote Pauli matrice and the Fermi energy, respectively. The superconducting gap is given by $\Delta(\vec{r}) = \Delta(T)[e^{i\phi_L}\Theta(-y)+e^{i\phi_R}\Theta(y-L_{F1}-L_{F2})]$. Here, $\Delta(T)$ accounts for the temperature-dependent energy gap. It satisfies the BCS relation $\Delta(T) = \Delta_0\tanh(1.74\sqrt{T_c/T-1})$ with T_c the superconducting critical temperature. $\Theta(y)$ is the unit step function, and $\phi_{L(R)}$ is the phase of the left (right) S. The exchange field $\vec{h}$ of F_p $(p = 1, 2)$ layer is described as: $\vec{h} = h_p(\sin\theta_p\cos\varphi_p, \sin\theta_p\sin\varphi_p, \cos\theta_p)$.

Based on the Bogoliubov transformation $\psi_\alpha(\vec{r}) = \sum_n[u_{n\alpha}(\vec{r})\hat{\gamma}_n + v^*_{n\alpha}(\vec{r})\hat{\gamma}^\dagger_n]$ and the anticommutation relations of the quasiparticle annihilation and creation operators $\hat{\gamma}_n$ and $\hat{\gamma}^\dagger_n$, we have the Bogoliubov-de Gennes (BdG) equation [1, 18]

$$\begin{pmatrix}\hat{H}(\vec{r}) & \hat{\Delta}(\vec{r})\\ -\hat{\Delta}^*(\vec{r}) & -\hat{H}^*(\vec{r})\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\hat{u}(\vec{r})\\ \hat{v}(\vec{r})\end{pmatrix} = E\begin{pmatrix}\hat{u}(\vec{r})\\ \hat{v}(\vec{r})\end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{H}(\vec{r}) = H_e\hat{\mathbf{1}} - h_z(\vec{r})\hat{\sigma}_z - h_y(\vec{r})\hat{\sigma}_y$ and $\hat{\Delta}(\vec{r}) = i\hat{\sigma}_y\Delta(\vec{r})$. Here $\hat{u}(\vec{r}) = (u_\uparrow(\vec{r}), u_\downarrow(\vec{r}))^T$ and $\hat{v}(\vec{r}) = (v_\uparrow(\vec{r}), v_\downarrow(\vec{r}))^T$ are two-component wave functions. The BdG equation can be solved for each superconducting electrode and F layer, respectively. We have four different incoming quasiparticles, electronlike quasiparticles (ELQs) and holelike quasiparticles (HLQs) with spin up and spin down. For an incident spin up electron in the left S, the wave function is

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^S_L(y) = &[ue^{i\phi_L/2}, 0, 0, ve^{-i\phi_L/2}]^T e^{ik_e y}\\ &+ a_1[ve^{i\phi_L/2}, 0, 0, ue^{-i\phi_L/2}]^T e^{ik_h y}\\ &+ b_1[ue^{i\phi_L/2}, 0, 0, ve^{-i\phi_L/2}]^T e^{-ik_e y}\\ &+ a'_1[0, -ve^{i\phi_L/2}, ue^{-i\phi_L/2}, 0]^T e^{ik_h y}\\ &+ b'_1[0, ue^{i\phi_L/2}, -ve^{-i\phi_L/2}, 0]^T e^{-ik_e y}.\end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In this process, the coefficients b_1, b'_1, a'_1, and a_1 describe normal reflection, the normal reflection with spin-flip, anomalous Andreev reflection, and normal Andreev reflection, respectively. Note that the momentum parallel to the interface is conserved in these processes.

The corresponding wave function in the right S is

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^S_R(y) = &c_1[ue^{i\phi_R/2}, 0, 0, ve^{-i\phi_R/2}]^T e^{ik_e y}\\ &+ d_1[ve^{i\phi_R/2}, 0, 0, ue^{-i\phi_R/2}]^T e^{-ik_h y}\\ &+ c'_1[0, ue^{i\phi_R/2}, -ve^{-i\phi_R/2}, 0]^T e^{ik_e y}\\ &+ d'_1[0, -ve^{i\phi_R/2}, ue^{-i\phi_R/2}, 0]^T e^{-ik_h y},\end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where c_1, d_1, c'_1, d'_1 are the transmission coefficients, corresponding to the reflection processes described above. The coherence factors are defined as usual, $u = \sqrt{(1+\Omega/E)/2}$, $v = \sqrt{(1-\Omega/E)/2}$ and $\Omega = \sqrt{E^2-\Delta^2}$. $k_{e(h)} = \sqrt{2m[E_F + (-)\Omega]/\hbar^2 - k^2_\parallel}$ are the perpendicular components of the wavevectors with $k_\parallel$ as the parallel component.

The wave function in the F_p layers can be described by transformation matrix [20] as

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi^F_p(y) = T_p\{&[e\cdot exp(ik^{e\uparrow}_{Fi}y) + f\cdot exp(-ik^{e\uparrow}_{Fi}y)]\hat{e}_1\\ &+ [e'\cdot exp(ik^{e\downarrow}_{Fi}y) + f'\cdot exp(-ik^{e\downarrow}_{Fi}y)]\hat{e}_2\\ &+ [g\cdot exp(-ik^{h\uparrow}_{Fi}y) + h\cdot exp(ik^{h\uparrow}_{Fi}y)]\hat{e}_3\\ &+ [g'\cdot exp(-ik^{h\downarrow}_{Fi}y) + h'\cdot exp(ik^{h\downarrow}_{Fi}y)]\hat{e}_4\}.\end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here $\hat{e}_1 = [1,0,0,0]^T$, $\hat{e}_2 = [0,1,0,0]^T$, $\hat{e}_3 = [0,0,1,0]^T$, $\hat{e}_4 = [0,0,0,1]^T$ are basis wave functions, and $k^{e(h)\sigma}_{Fi} = \sqrt{2m[E_F + (-)E + \rho_\sigma h_i]/\hbar^2 - k^2_\parallel}$ with $\rho_{\uparrow(\downarrow)} = 1(-1)$ are the perpendicular components of wave vectors for ELQs and HLQs. The transformation matrix is defined as

$$T_p = \begin{pmatrix}\hat{U} & 0\\ 0 & \hat{U}^*\end{pmatrix}, \hat{U} = \begin{pmatrix}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}e^{-i\varphi} & -\sin\frac{\theta}{2}e^{-i\varphi}\\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2} & \cos\frac{\theta}{2}\end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

All scattering coefficients can be determined by solving

wave functions at the interfaces

$$\Psi_L^S(y_1)=\Psi_1^F(y_1),\partial_y[\psi_1^F-\psi_L^S]|_{y_1}=2k_FZ_1\psi_L^S(y_1);$$
$$\Psi_1^F(y_2)=\Psi_2^F(y_2),\partial_y[\psi_2^F-\psi_1^F]|_{y_2}=2k_FZ_2\psi_1^F(y_2);$$
$$\Psi_2^F(y_3)=\Psi_R^S(y_3),\partial_y[\psi_R^S-\psi_2^F]|_{y_3}=2k_FZ_3\psi_R^S(y_3), \quad (7)$$

where $y_{1-3}=0,L_{F1},L_{F1}+L_{F2}$. Z_{1-3} are dimensionless parameters describing the magnitude of the interfacial resistances, and $k_F=\sqrt{2mE_F}$ is the Fermi wave vector. From the boundary conditions, we obtain a system of linear equations that yield the scattering coefficients. With this coefficients at hand, we can use the finite-temperature Green's function formalism [21–23] to calculate dc Josephson current,

$$I_e(\phi)=\frac{k_BTe\Delta}{4\hbar}\sum_{k_\parallel}\sum_{\omega_n}\frac{k_e(\omega_n)+k_h(\omega_n)}{\Omega_n}\cdot$$
$$[\frac{a_1(\omega_n,\phi)-a_2(\omega_n,\phi)}{k_e}+\frac{a_3(\omega_n,\phi)-a_4(\omega_n,\phi)}{k_h}], \quad (8)$$

where $\omega_n=\pi k_BT(2n+1)$ are the Matsubara frequencies with $n=0,1,2,\ldots$ and $\Omega_n=\sqrt{\omega_n^2+\Delta^2(T)}$. $k_e(\omega_n)$, $k_h(\omega_n)$, and $a_j(\omega_n,\phi)$ with $j=1,2,3,4$ are obtained from k_e, k_h, and a_j by analytic continuation $E\to i\omega_n$. Then the critical current is derived from $I_c=max_\phi\{|I_e(\phi)|\}$.

We will use the superconducting gap Δ_0 as the unit of energy. The Fermi energy is $E_F=1000\Delta_0$, the interface transparency is $Z_{1-3}=0$, and $T/T_c=0.1$. We fix the length of the F_2 layer $k_FL_{F2}=6$. The magnetization directions of the F_1 and F_2 are oriented along the z axis ($\theta_1=0$, $\varphi_1=0$) and y axis ($\theta_2=\pi/2$, $\varphi_2=\pi/2$), respectively.

In fig. 2 (a), we compare the dependence of the critical current I_c on the length k_FL_{F1} for two different F_2 layer exchange field h_2/E_F. It is well known that, for $h_2/E_F=0$, the critical current I_c exhibits oscillations with a period $2\pi\xi_F$ and simultaneously decays exponentially on the length scale of ξ_F [1]. Here, ξ_F is the magnetic coherence length. The main reason is that only the singlet pairs $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle-|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ and triplet pairs $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle+|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ exist in the F_1 layer, and these pairs can be suppressed by the exchange field. In contrast, if $h_2/E_F=0.16$, we find that I_c slowly decreased with the thickness k_FL_{F1}, and a long-range superharmonic current appears. In Fig. 3 (a), we use the electron and hole transport process to further explain our calculated result. Because the magnetization directions of the F_2 layer is along the y axis, which is orthogonal to the magnetization of F_1 layer, the spin-mixing and spin-flip scattering processes will appear in the F_2 region. If the Coopers $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{14}$ and $|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_{32}$ transmit from the right S to F_2 layer, the spin-mixing will result a mixture of singlet component and triplet component with zero spin projection $(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{14}-|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_{32})\cos(Q\cdot R)+i\cdot(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{14}+|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_{32})\sin(Q\cdot R)$ in F_2 layer. The spin-flip process can convert $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{14}+|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_{32}$ into the equal-spin pairs $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_{14}$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle_{32}$ [10]. This parallel spin pairs will penetrate coherently over a long distances into the F_1 layer, and finally has been transformed into $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{12}$ and $|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_{34}$ pairs near the SF_1 interface by normal Andreev reflection. So the dominant contribution to the Josephson current stems from the transport of the even number of pairs. Interestingly, as depicted in the inset of Fig. 2 (a), the period of this current now becomes π and satisfies the superharmonic current-phase relation $I_e(\phi)\propto\sin 2\phi$ [16, 17].



FIG. 2. (Color online) (a) Critical current as a function of the length k_FL_{F1} for exchange field $h_2/E_F=0$ (thin blue line) and $h_2/E_F=0.16$ (thick magenta line) with $h_1/E_F=0.1$. The inset describe the Josephson current-phase relation $I_e(\phi)$ for $k_FL_{F1}=200$ and same other parameters as in main panel. (b) Critical current as a function of h_1/E_F for $k_FL_{F1}=200$ and $h_2/E_F=0.16$. The inset illustrate the behavior of critical current vs h_2/E_F for $h_1/E_F=0.3$ and $k_FL_{F1}=200$.

Next, we discuss the dependence of critical current on the exchange field h_2/E_F and h_1/E_F at fixed F_1 layer length $k_FL_{F1}=200$. As plotted in the inset of Fig. 2 (b), the critical current displays an oscillating behavior as a function of exchange field h_2/E_F for $h_1/E_F=0.3$. We attribute this characteristic behavior to the oscillations of the spin-triplet state $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{14}+|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_{32}$ in F_2 layer with period $Q\cdot R$. As described in Ref. [24], for a fixed F_2 layer length R ($k_FL_{F2}=6$), the total momenta Q of $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{14}+|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_{32}$ will vary with the the exchange field h_2/E_F and $Q\cdot R$ will undergo the $0-\pi$ transitions. The oscillated $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{14}+|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle_{32}$ in F_2 layer can be converted into the $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_{14}$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle_{32}$ in F_1 layer by the spin-flip scattering. As a result, the oscillated critical current will be obtained.

On the other hand, for $k_FL_{F1}=200$ and $h_2/E_F=$



FIG. 3. (color online) the transportation of Coopers through the $S/F_1/F_2/S$ junction for the weak F_1 layer (a) and the fully spin-polarized F_1 layer (b).



FIG. 4. (Color online) The real parts of spin-triplet pair amplitude f_0 (left vertical axis), $f_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $f_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ (right vertical axis) plotted as a function of the position $k_F y$ for three values of the exchange field $h_1/E_F = 0.1, 0.5, 1.0$ (from top to bottom) with $k_F L_{F1} = 200$, $h_2/E_F = 0.16$, $\omega_D t = 4$ and $\phi = 0$. Here, the dash-dotted lines denote the interfaces of SF.

0.16, the critical current I_c almost monotonically decreases to become 0 as the h_1/E_F is increased (see the main plot in Fig. 2 (b)). This is easily understood because normal Andreev reflection occurred at the SF_1 interface will be suppressed by exchange splitting of F_1 layer. If $h_1/E_F = 1$, the F_1 is converted into half metal and only one spin band can be occupied, then the normal Andreev reflections at the SF_1 interface will be completely replaced by normal reflections. As depicted in Fig. 3 (b), the electron transport in F_1 layer can be described as: the electron $|\uparrow\rangle_1$ impinging on the SF_1 interface is reflected back and becomes electron $|\uparrow\rangle_2$. Subsequently, the electron $|\uparrow\rangle_2$ will be converted into a hole $|\uparrow\rangle_3$ moving to left by anomalous Andreev reflection. This hole $|\uparrow\rangle_3$ is further reflected normally as a hole $|\uparrow\rangle_4$. Finally, the hole $|\uparrow\rangle_4$ will propagate to the right and be reflected back as electron $|\uparrow\rangle_1$. This process is analogous to the equal-spin Andreev reflection reported in Ref. [25]. Based on this process, it is easy to understand the entire process: the Cooper pair $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{14}$ injecting from the right S is converted into the parallel triplet pair $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_{14}$. This pair $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_{14}$ will be consequently reflected normally back as a pair $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_{23}$ at the SF_1 interface. Then the pair $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle_{23}$ is transformed into a pair $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{23}$, and the pair $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle_{23}$ transports to the right S at last. In this process, none of Coopers can penetrate into the left S, so the Josephson current would be completely suppressed.

III. ODD-FREQUENCY TRIPLET PAIRING

The above results for Josephson current are obtained in the stepwise approximation for the pair potential. In principle, to have a complete description of the odd-frequency triplet amplitude functions, we need to solve the BdG equation (2) by Bogoliubov's self-consistent field method [18, 26–28]. Assume the junction has been put in a one dimensional square potential well with infinitely high walls. Accordingly, the solution in equation (2) can be expanded a set of basis vectors of the stationary states [29], $u_\sigma(\vec{r}) = \sum_q u_q^\sigma \zeta_q(y)$ and $v_\sigma(\vec{r}) = \sum_q v_q^\sigma \zeta_q(y)$ with $\zeta_q(y) = \sqrt{2/L_d}\sin(q\pi y/L_d)$. Here q is a positive integer and $L_d = L_{S1} + L_{F1} + L_{F2} + L_{S2}$. L_{S1} and L_{S2} are thickness of left and right Ss, respectively. The BdG equation (2) is solved iteratively together with the self-

consistency condition [18]

$$\Delta(y) = \frac{g(y)}{2} \sum_{0\le E\le\omega_D} [u_\uparrow(y)v_\downarrow^*(y) - u_\downarrow(y)v_\uparrow^*(y)] \times \tanh(\frac{E}{2k_BT}), \quad (9)$$

where ω_D is the Debye cutoff energy and the effective attractive coupling $g(y)$ is a constant in the superconductor and can vanish outside of it. Iterations are not performed until self-consistency is reached, starting from the stepwise approximation for the pair potential. The triplet pair amplitude functions are defined as follows [27, 28]

$$f_0(y,t) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{E>0}[u_\uparrow(y)v_\downarrow^*(y) + u_\downarrow(y)v_\uparrow^*(y)]S(t), \quad (10)$$

$$f_{\alpha\alpha}(y,t) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{E>0} u_\alpha(y)v_\alpha^*(y)S(t), \quad (11)$$

where $S(t) = \cos(Et) - i\sin(Et)\tanh(E/2k_BT)$. Additionally, the singlet pair amplitude writes as $f_3 \equiv \Delta(y)/g(y)$. The above singlet and triplet pair amplitudes are all normalized to the value of the singlet pairing amplitude in a bulk S material. In this method, we consider the low temperature limit and take $k_FL_{S1} = k_FL_{S2} = 400$, $\omega_D/E_F = 0.1$. The other parameters are the same as the BTK approach.

The spatial distributions of the spin-triplet pairs for different exchange fields h_1/E_F are illustrated in Fig. 4. For weak exchange field $h_1/E_F = 0.1$, $f_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $f_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ generated in the vicinity of the SF_2 interface have almost identical amplitude. Their magnitudes will decay spatially near the SF_1 interface. These decay characteristics arise from the fact that the pairs $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ are recombined into the pairs $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$. Furthermore, we find that f_0 can not penetrates over a long distance into F_1 layer. So the superharmonic current mostly arises from the contribution of $f_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $f_{\downarrow\downarrow}$. As plotted in Fig. 4 (b), when the exchange field is increased to $h_1/E_F = 0.5$, $f_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $f_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ near the SF_2 interface are all suppressed. In contrast, around the SF_1 interface, the magnitude of $f_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ is suppressed strongly, but $f_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ increases instead. Moreover, with the decrease of $f_{\downarrow\downarrow}$, the recombination effect at the SF_1 interface would become weakened, which leads to the decrease of the superharmonic current. A fully spin-polarized case $h_1/E_F = 1$ is illustrated in Fig. 4 (c), $f_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ in the F_1 region would be inhibited. But $f_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ still exists and it's magnitude grows big enough near the SF_1 interface. This can be explained that the normal Andreev reflection at the SF_1 interface is entirely transformed into the normal reflection, which makes the Cooper pairs can not be transmitted to the left S.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this article, we have studied the long-range superharmonic Josephson current by BTK approach in a clean $S/F_1/F_2/S$ junction with noncollinear magnetizations. We have found that the critical current will oscillate with the exchange field of the thin spin-active F_2 layer. This feature is induced by the spatial oscillations of the triplet pairs $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle+|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ in F_2 layer. Specially, this critical current almost decreases monotonically with the exchange field in the thick conducting F_1 layer and is strictly forbidden on the condition that the F_1 is converted into half metal. However, the parallel spin-triplet pairs don't disappear but increase instead in the vicinity of the SF_1 interface. This distinctive behavior can be attribute to the transition from normal Andreev reflections to normal reflections at the SF_1 interface, then the parallel spin-triplet pairs still exist but none of Cooper pairs can penetrate from the F_1 into the left S. Finally, we have also calculated the odd-frequency triplet amplitudes to further describe this process.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the State Key Program for Basic Research of China under Grants No. 2011CB922103 and No. 2010CB923400, and the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grants No. 11174125 and No. 11074109.

[1] A. I. Buzdin, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 935 (2005).
[2] F. S. Bergeret, A. F. Volkov, and K. B. Efetov, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 1321 (2005).
[3] R. S. Keizer, S. T. B. Goennenwein, T. M. Klapwijk, G. Miao, G. Xiao and A. Gupta, Nature 439, 825 (2006).
[4] J. W. A. Robinson, J. D. S. Witt, M. G. Blamire, Science 329, 59 (2010).
[5] T. S. Khaire, M. A. Khasawneh, W. P. Pratt, Jr., and N. O. Birge, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 137002 (2010).
[6] Carolin Klose, Trupti S. Khaire, Yixing Wang, W. P. Pratt, Jr., Norman O. Birge, B. J. McMorran, T. P. Ginley, J. A. Borchers, B. J. Kirby, B. B. Maranville, and J. Unguris, Phys. Rev. Lett. 108, 127002 (2012).
[7] M. Houzet and A. I. Buzdin, Phys. Rev. B 76, 060504(R) (2007).
[8] V. Braude and Yu.V. Nazarov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 077003 (2007).
[9] M. Eschrig, J. Kopu, J. C. Cuevas, and G. Schon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 137003 (2003); M. Eschrig and T. Lofwan-

der, Nature Physics 4, 138 (2008).
[10] M. Eschrig, Phys. Today 64, No. 1, 43 (2011).
[11] F. S. Bergeret, A. F. Volkov, and K. B. Efetov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 4096 (2001).
[12] Mohammad Alidoust, Jacob Linder, Gholamreza Rashedi, Takehito Yokoyama, and Asle Sudbo, Phys. Rev. B 81, 014512 (2010).
[13] G. B. Halasz, M. G. Blamire, and J. W. A. Robinson, Phys. Rev. B 84, 024517 (2011).
[14] A. F. Volkov and K. B. Efetov, Phys. Rev. B 81, 144522 (2010).
[15] Yasuhiro Asano, Yukio Tanaka, and Alexander A. Golubov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 107002 (2007); Yasuhiro Asano, Yuki Sawa, Yukio Tanaka, and Alexander A. Golubov, Phys. Rev. B 76, 224525 (2007).
[16] Luka Trifunovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. 107, 047001 (2011); Luka Trifunovic, Zorica Popovic, and Zoran Radovic, Phys. Rev. B 84, 064511 (2011).
[17] Caroline Richard, Manuel Houzet, and Julia S. Meyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 217004 (2013).
[18] P. G. de Gennes, Superconductivity of Metals and Alloys, Benjamin, New York, 1966 (Chap.5).
[19] G. E. Blonder, M. Tinkham, and T. M. Klapwijk, Phys. Rev. B 25, 4515 (1982).
[20] Li-Jing Jin, Yue Wang, Lin Wen, Guo-Qiao Zha, and Shi-Ping Zhou, Physics Letters A 376, 2435 (2012).
[21] A. Furusaki and M. Tsukada, Solid State Commun. 78, 299 (1991).
[22] Z. M. Zheng and D. Y. Xing, J. Phys.: Condens. Matter 21, 385703 (2009).
[23] Y. Tanaka and S. Kashiwaya, Phys. Rev. B 56, 892 (1997).
[24] Hao Meng, Xiuqiang Wu, and Zhiming Zheng, Europhys. Lett. 104, 37003 (2013).
[25] C. Visani, Z. Sefrioui, J. Tornos, C. Leon, J. Briatico, M. Bibes, A. Barthlmy, J. Santamara, and Javier E. Villegas, Nature Physics 8, 539 (2012).
[26] J. B. Ketterson and S. N. Song, Superconductivity, Cambridge University Press, 1999 (Part III).
[27] Klaus Halterman, Oriol T. Valls, and Paul H. Barsic, Phys. Rev. B 77, 174511 (2008).
[28] Hao Meng, Lin Wen, Guo-Qiao Zha, and Shi-Ping Zhou, Phys. Rev. B 83, 214506 (2011).
[29] L. D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz, Quantum Mechanics, Non-Relativistic Theory (third ed.) Pergamon, Elmsford, NY (1977).